

parum carinato, elytris parum convexis, ferè rotundatis, medio nigris areolatis; lateribus late luteo-fulvis, intus irregularibus, maculis 5 vel 6 rotundatis nigris in utroque, margineque tenui nigro. Long. corp. lin. 10. Habitat Mexico. Mus. Melly.

Obs. Hæc duo insecta sese mutuo singulariter repræsentant.

9. TÆNODEMA, Laporte., Erichs.; *T. cincta*, W. Cæruleo-nigra, pronoto 3-carinato, abdomine nigro segmentis 1—4 fascia lata in margine postico rufa (in medio interrupta) segmentoque apicali rufo, labro in medio fisso, scutello elongato-triangulari articuloque 4^{to}, tarsorum posticorum magno. Long. corp. lin. 10½. Habitat Brasilia. Mus. Melly.
10. AMPEDUS, Meg.; *A. perpulcher*, W. Fulvo-rufus, leviter punctatus, scutello et elytris læte cæruleis tenuissime punctatis, tarsis antennis (articulo basali fulvo excepto) abdomineque nigris tarsorum articulis 3^{us} basalibus subtus laminiferis, antennis articulis 2 et 3 minutis. Long. corp. lin. 10. Habitat Africa tropicali. Mus. Melly.

XXVI.—On the names *Promecoderus*, *Cnemacanthus* and *Odontoscelis*, as applied to certain genera of Carabideous Insects. By G. R. WATERHOUSE, Esq., Curator to the Zoological Society of London.

To the Editors of the *Annals and Magazine of Natural History*.

GENTLEMEN,

YOU will oblige me by inserting in the 'Annals' the following observations upon some remarks contained in the 'Revue Zoologique.' In that periodical I am accused of adopting a generic name given by one of my own countrymen in preference to one previously given to the same group by a French entomologist. It is stated that "M. Waterhouse, par un esprit national que nous devons respecter, a adopté le nom de *Odontoscelis*, Curtis, de préférence à celui de *Cnemacanthus*, Brullé, quoique ce dernier fût bien antérieur."

This is the first time I have been accused of this *esprit national*, which M. Reiche considers *ne serait rien moins que respectable**. These remarks I should not have noticed, but the editor of the 'Revue' has inserted a kind of defence of my proceedings, giving me an opening for escape on the score of ignorance of certain facts, which facts however, strange to say, were first pointed out by myself in the very paper in which I am supposed to have committed myself.

It would be supposed from what has been stated, that the name *Cnemacanthus* originated with M. Brullé; it so happens

* M. Reiche endeavours to exonerate me from the charge, for which I owe him many thanks, though I do not consider he has succeeded in the attempt.

however that that name has never been given by that author to any genus of insects, but was adopted by him by mistake—he supposing that certain *Carabidæ* of South America belonged to the genus *Cnemacanthus*, founded by Mr. G. Gray upon an insect which proves to be a native of Australia, which insect had previously received the generic name *Promecoderus* by Dejean. But in the notice in the ‘Revue,’ before mentioned, M. Guérin seems to think I may be excused, “ne sachant pas que le *Cnemacanthus* figuré par M. Gray était un vrai *Promecoderus**.” Now I will venture to assert that the author of those remarks learnt those very facts from my paper, for they were there pointed out for the first time; and in the ‘Magazine de Zoologie’ he describes several species of *Odontoscelis* as members of Mr. Gray’s genus *Cnemacanthus*. To make the matter more clear, I may mention that, according to the views of Dejean and Brullé, the genus *Cnemacanthus* or *Promecoderus* (these being synonymous) belongs to the family *Harpalidæ*, having the intermediate as well as the anterior tarsi dilated, and the genus *Odontoscelis* belongs to the family *Feronidæ*.

We will call the first of these genera A, and the second B. In 1829, Dejean names the genus A, *Promecoderus*, and in 1832 Gray names the same genus *Cnemacanthus*. In 1835 Brullé uses the name *Cnemacanthus* (quoting Gray as his authority for that name) for the genus B; and in 1838 Guérin follows Brullé in using the name *Cnemacanthus* (also quoting Gray as his authority for the name) for genus B, neither of these entomologists being aware that the insects they described belonged to a different section to that described by Gray under the name *Cnemacanthus*, though they might have suspected as much from the difference of habitat given.

In 1838 (published in 1839) genus B receives a name for the first time, viz. *Odontoscelis* †.

* To show how ignorant I was of this fact, I will quote two passages from my paper—“*Cnemacanthus* of Gray (which is the *Promecoderus* of Dejean).” Again, “*Cnemacanthus gibbosus* of Gray appears to me to be the *Promecoderus brunnipes* of Dejean, which is from Van Diemen’s Land, and perhaps from some other parts of Australia, and not from Africa, as has been stated. The genus *Cnemacanthus* of Guérin and Brullé, being synonymous with Mr. Curtis’s genus *Odontoscelis*, the species of which are from South America, must not be confounded with *Cnemacanthus* of Gray.”

† I was not aware, when my first paper was written, that the name *Odontoscelis* had been previously used for a genus of Hemipterous insects (not that this in any way affects the question at issue); this fact I however soon afterwards had pointed out to me by Mr. White, and in my next paper I called Mr. Curtis’s attention to it, and begged of him to propose some other name in its stead. To this request Mr. Curtis paid no attention; I shall therefore propose that the name *Scaritidea* be used to designate the

In 1840, Mr. Waterhouse having some new species of genus B to describe, characterized them under the name *Odontoscelis*, and did not call those insects *Cnemacanthus* simply because they did not belong to that group.

In 1841 Mr. Waterhouse is accused of partiality for his own countrymen's names, in adopting the term *Odontoscelis* instead of *Cnemacanthus* (a practice allowed to be of most pernicious consequences to the science); but *both* of these names being given by his own countrymen, the accusation is absurd.

Yours, &c.

G. R. WATERHOUSE.

XXVII.—*On the Eel, and on the Freshwater Fish of Austria.* By CAPT. S. E. WIDDRINGTON*, R.N.

On the Eel.

IN his account of this genus, Mr. Yarrell quotes a writer who appears to have paid some attention to the subject, and who states that its susceptibility of cold prevents its inhabiting various northern rivers, amongst others the Danube. Notwithstanding this high authority, being aware of the habits of the fish of burying itself in the mud during the winter, I confess I was not quite satisfied with this theory, and considered that if they were wanting in the Danube, some other cause must be found than the one assigned.

During a recent tour in Germany I was surprised to see eels put upon the table at Wurtzburg, which is high up the Mayn, and in a very cold country, during winter. I was subsequently informed that they are abundant at Hanau, lower down the same river, the waters of which must be at least as cold as those of the Danube.

On arriving at Vienna I mentioned the circumstance to Professor Heckel, who has charge of the ichthyological department, who informed me that great numbers were brought to Vienna from Ulm, which is high up the river, but that they had never been seen lower down. Subsequent inquiry, and having ascertained the very great pains which have been taken in investigating the natural history of the river, satisfied me that this account was true, and that it is next to impossible they should not have been detected had they frequented the Lower Danube.

genus of which I published a monograph, under the name *Odontoscelis*—unless M. Guérin is willing to use his sectional name *Cnemalobus* in a generic sense for the same group.

* Late Cook. Read in the Section of Zoology and Botany at the meeting of the British Association, Plymouth, and communicated by the Author.